App F. IX-4

193[illegible]-35
([illegible])

File No. 152-32
Serial Nos. 1 - [illegible]

Previous References

[illegible]

Later References

[illegible] 72-36 1-4

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for [illegible]

SUBJECT.

Re. ~~[illegible]~~ exempting Sri. Dhurvinasti Ramanujam from paying Rokkanaveh in respect of his [illegible] Seva in the Sri Varaguneswamy Temple after

No ~~[illegible]~~ 1506 dt 27-4-36

To K. T. Chandrasekhara Iyengar, B.A., B.L., Vakil, Cottonpet, Bangalore

Informed that Govt. see no reason to modify the order.

[illegible] 29/5

Serial No.

Application dated 26.9.1932 from the Superintendent, Sri Parakala Matt, Mysore, (through Mr K. J. Bhaskara Iyengar, Advocate, Bangalore) requesting that G.O. no 1616/Revy 2-30-88 dated the 5th/7th May 1932, exempting Veeti Thiruvaimoli Ramanuja Chariar of Melkote, from playing Rokkavacha in respect of the Nehimi Seva at the Sri Narayana Swami temple at Melkote, may be set aside and that till orders are issued the orders already passed in the matter [illegible]

2) Kind reference is invited to ~~paras~~ orders at paras 28, 29, ~~and~~ 30 and 33 of Revenue [illegible] 2-30 [illegible]

[illegible]

5 Government exempted the opponent from payment of Rokkavacha on the recommendation of the Muz Commr supporting that of the Deputy Commissioner made after detailed enquiry. It is for consideration if this should be reversed now on the appeal of the Sri Parakala

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

File No. 152 152 of 1932.

Mutt, whose loss in consequence of the Government orders cannot be much and who have appealed in Septr against an order passed in May.

Whether a report has to be called for on the petn, in view to the statement that orders were passed without hearing them, is for orders.

OFF
Fl.
18 OCT 1932
No 2356

H. Secy)
(for Mr)

MSK
21/10/32

18/10

18/10

The Mutt may be given a hearing. Reports may be called for.

21.10.32

19/10

Both the petitions, called for consolidation. (No orders have been passed on the petition. Only the facility for a stay order)

Some orders approved.
21/10/32

A — For orders.
21/10/32

For Secy)

21 OCT 1932
GENL. ADMN. SEC.

No stay order can be issued

28/10/3

Serial No.

1

Letter No 646 dated the 24th Oct 1932 to the Income Commr forwarding the application for refund with records.

Ref ce:- orders at para 8 of the notes supra.

Resubmitted for orders re request for a day order.

C.B. 24/10/32

For Secy)

24/10/32

Mr. MN

Mr 25/10.

See previous page 25/10/32

Mr 28/10/32

25/10

Left Sated for orders

C.B. 31/10/32

Why not use the printed card.

1/11/32

A printed card of the kind referred to above, is placed on file. Officers not concerned [illegible]

26 OCT. 1932 2522

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

File No. 152 372 of 1932 Secret

On all the points on which a communication is proposed to be sent to Mr Bhashyam Iyengar. Regrets & for orders

7/11/32

4/11/32

TYPING SECTION
4 NOV 1932
CIVIL & REV SECT

Letter No 739 dated the 5th NOV 1932 to Mr K S Bhashyam Iyengar, Advocate, Bangalore, informing him that the application of the Superintendent of the Sri Parthasarathi Swami Temple is receiving attention, but that his requests for other orders cannot be issued

Letter No 427/32-33 & 22/12/32 from the Municipal Commissioner submitting a report together with the records connected with the grant of Ved. Tiruvengadachari Ramanujachari from paying Rokkabecha in respect of the Nelime sevas in Sri Narayana Swami temple at Melkote

The facts of the case are fully reported by the M.C. in his letter of 16/3/32 × R

× The several recommendations made therein have been approved by Govt in their order in K161 Misc 2-30-8 & 07 7/5/32 × M-

Mus Revenue II of 32-33

General and Revenue Secretariat | Mus File No. 152 of 193 | [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

15) Vide minutes in paras supra. orders be solicited as to the date to which the case may be posted for a hearing.

4/1 — 2nd Mem) RB 4.1.33

Secretariat Council 4 JAN No. 2.3.11.

16) The Member desires that this case may be posted for hearing on Saturday the 28th January '33 — 2 P.M.

5/1.

5/1/33

Petition of 4.1.33 from Mr. K. T. Bhashyam Iyengar Advocate for the Petitioner Mutt praying for a stay order in the matter.

20) Minutes of the Second Member of Council on the P.M.D.

Presented by Mr. K. T. Bhashyam

6 Petition of 5.1.33 from the same advocate praying for reasons set forth therein the grant of a stay order in the meanwhile pending final orders of Government.

Kind reference is invited to the minutes in para 9 supra of the Then First Member of " i.e. As directed therein the Advocate in question has been definitely told in this office letter of 5/1.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Thus I entered

File No. 152 of 1932 — General and Secretariat

that his request for a stay order can not be granted.

The case is posted to 25th inst for a hearing & in view of this whether it would be possible to go behind the orders already passed on an Salzach is for consideration —

6.3
6/1

(Fwd Secy)
2nd dtr)

KB
6.1.33

7.1.33.

9/1/33

Orders have been already passed by the First member refusing a stay order & no reason exists for any reconsidn.

SPM
9/1

[illegible] to the [illegible] is [illegible]. After issue, [illegible] [illegible] to the [illegible]

12/1

GS
11/1

12/1/33

No 1039 dt 13-1-33 to Mr K. T. Bhashyam Iyengar. Advocate Cocanada Bangalore City. intimating that there is no reason for reconsidering the orders passed and intimated to him in Ref No Y 399 of 1/11/32 —

TYPING SECTION
13 JAN 1933
& REVISED

25 Rules with the Corrected file bearing
D. No 745 of 32-33.

Gm
61

File Seen) 6/1/33

Dewan)

6/1/33

DEWAN'S OFFICE
398 of
JAN 1933

Secy. Thanks
for perusal
7/1/33

2nd Mr)

of the
Second Member of Council,
9 JAN. 33
No.....

Misc Revision No of 32-33.

General and Revenue Secretariat | Misc File No. 152 of 193 | [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

x Pu. & II

Kind reply is invited to the petn of 5th/1/33 filed by Mr K. T. Bhashyam Iyengar Advocate on behalf of one Sri Pada Thangal Tirunavanaiya of Melkote. The petn is not only signed by the Tirunavanaiya, though the Vakalat given to Mr Bhashyam Iyengar bears his signature. He has also prayed that the order of exemption of Thundigandi Ramanujam from payment of Rokkavecha may be set aside. It is for orders if notice may be issued to him.

GS
28/3

The petn is not signed but this is perhaps due to an oversight as the Vakalat is signed by the party. The Advocate for the petnr is the same as for the Sri Parakala Math. Orders are solicited if a notice has to be issued to this party also so that he may also be heard & the question disposed of once for all.

28/3/33

For Secy)
1st Mr

Yes
23/3/33

28/3

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

65

This case was heard on the 5th April 1933.

The petitioner was represented by Mr.K.T.Bhashyam; the opponent was present with his lawyer Mr. T.G.Naraina Iyengar.

Mr. Bhashyam stated that the consent of the Sri Parakala Mutt had been obtained for allowing exemption to the Ahobala and Vanamamalai Mutts from the payment of Rokkavecha and offered to produce the connected documents. He also wanted to produce the Sannad of 1830 giving this privilege to the Sri Parakala Mutt. The submission of these documents may be awaited.

It is necessary to obtain information on the following points and the Muzrai Commissioner may be addressed for furnishing it:

(1) Apart from the Ahobala and Vanamamalai Mutts, are any other Mutts or individuals exempted from the payment of fees for sevas performed by them, and if so what is the authority for such exemption?

(2) In his report dated 16th May 1931, the Sub-Division Officer makes the following statement:

> "From enquiries made in the temple office today, I was given to understand that Arulpadu is now being done free to Parichariks, Sthaniks and Sree-Patha-Thangas when specified sevas are being done by them and by Sree Parakala Mutt."

Does this mean that all these persons or institutions are allowed to perform sevas without the payment of prescribed fees?

(3) Are there any cases in which, though fees are recovered for sevas, no share of ~~it~~ them is paid to the Sree Parakala Mutt?

Serial No.

(4) Is Arulpadu an honour shown only to Sevarthakaras or also to others like Heads of Mutts or Acharyapurushas on occasions other than those on which the latter themselves are not Sevarthakaras?

(5) Is Arulpadu a separate function different from Sevartha with a fee prescribed therefor, or is it only a function which is part of a Sevartha?

Mule
5/4/33
574

14/4

No 1478 8 18-4-1933 to the Inam Commission calling for information on several points raised therein

(4) [illegible]

(5) [illegible] of the Annual [illegible] 20/1/35

31/12

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

Report no. 277/32-33 of 20.1.35 from the Amildar Srirangapatam TK addressed to the D.C. Proceedings contd. regd. to his letter no. H.474/33 of 20.11.33.

Subject:— Prayer of Mr. Thiruvai Muli Ramanujachar for exemption of paying Coolie towards the preparation of "Charupu" ie naivedya for the deity in Melkote temple & the appeal preferred by the Agent of Sri Parakala Mutt, that none else should be allowed this privilege excepting the mutt which he is representing.

Re: several items raised in letter no 1478/mung 152-32-8 of 18/4/33 from the H Sec to the M.C.:—

1) Only Sri Parakala mutt is exempted from paying Rokkavecha; no other mutt or any individual is allowed this concession. As per Govt. order no 16-16/mung 2-30-88 of 7-5-32 Mr. Thiruvai Muli Ramanujachar is granted (1) Kutumba Tirtha (2) Rokkavecha exemption in respect of his Nehini Sevas & (3) Adhyapaka post & this is in force.

Mr. Thiruvai muli Ramanujachar has since represented that he has been allowed exemption from payment of Rokkavecha only & that he has not been exempted from paying "Charapu Coolie" & that this latter privilege be granted to him. The Dharmadarsis of the temple have opined as follows:—

Serial No.

The authority on which Sri Parakala Mutt was exempted from paying Charapu Coolie is not forthcoming. Mr. Thiruvicmuli Ramanujachar may also be given this concession if he has got any authority to claim this. It is known that Charapu Coolie charges are collected with a view to replace the old cooking vessels in the temple by purchasing new ones & to attend to the repairs etc of the vessels in use. It is levied from all & is in force. The petr was also paying formerly Rokkavecha and exemption was allowed only recently. As this forms the subject matter of the appeal before Govt, the opinion cannot be given just now (Vide resolution of 2-2-34).

+ Paper seal.

2) Rokkavecha in respect of Sevas mentioned in the Patti of 1862 is not being collected even now. Only Charapu Coolie at 3 pies per seer is levied from all except Sri Parakala Mutt. People that perform Sevas Avalatpadi is continued in case of the Patti. Sevas are done without collecting Rokkavecha in respect of Processions conducted at Govt cost & Sevas rendered from time immemorial.

3) Sri Parakala Mutt is not given any share in Rokkavecha collected in respect of several items & nothing is paid to the Mutt

13)

Muz File No. 152 of 1932. General Se

from Collections made at the hives of Sevartha Abhishekha, Ashtotra, & Sahasranama -

4) "Aralappad" is a mangala or an honour shown & is not confined to men who conduct sevas. This is done as it were an order from God himself in the case of those that are concerned in Sevas like Sri Murti & H. & H. - Aralappad is done even in the case of those that perform "Vedaparayana", people of "Geeyal Goshti" & Purohits, who are not Sevarthagars.

5) "Aralappad" is no seva in itself it forms a part of seva which is done in the Temple -

6) No concession was shown in the revised scale of Sevartha fees that came into force in 1931 - Rokkavecha is not levied from Sevarthagars found in the 4th list (Phirist 8) received from the Temple authority - As these sevas are done from time immemorial, "no thing is levied in respect of these as mamool". After revision, there was a good deal of correspondence on the subject & no order appears to have been passed about exempting these & this is going on as before -

7) The order ~~that~~ allowing exemption from payment of Rokkavecha by Sri Murti until further orders is not forthcoming - It appears that it is mixed

Misc Review Mf 32-33

General and Revenue Secretariat — Misc File No. 152 of 1932 — [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

up with records relating to other cases of Rokkavecha of the temple & reported in a separate Connection. Nevertheless attempts are being made to trace the same & as soon as it is available it will be reported on. The ancestors of Thiruvai-mulo Ramanujachar appear to have come & settled at the time of Sri Ramanujachar & the petitioner is known to belong to "Stala Acharya Jonnuskaru". In these circumstances orders as you may deem fit may be passed in respect of the levy of Rokkavecha & Champu Coolie.

Sd/ Submit with reference to para 4 & 5 page 10 of the notes.

CS 31/10

5) Please submit tomorrow along with a note showing in juxtaposition the points raised by the 1st Member & the replies received in respect of them.

8/10

Submit with Statement as discussed

CS 9/11

Kind reference is invited to the I Member's minutes at paras 39 to 41 supra. A note is submitted (Flag E) showing in juxtaposition these questions &

11/11

The delay in the submission of this is unsatisfactory & should be explained by the C.S. concerned immediately.

8/11

The C.S. has given the file only on 31/10. The file was kept with him for long before submitting it to this.

8/11

It is seen from the Branch diary that it was submitted on 1-11-35 to the Asst Secretary

8/11

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—13-7 35

File No. 152 1295 of 193 20 General Se

Member and the replies as furnished by the Amildar or the Petitioner. With refce to para 40 it is also stated that Mr K Bhashyam has not till now produced any documents in support of his statement as promised - The Revision petn is for orders. It is stated that the request for a stay order has not been granted.

12/11/35

Gen: Secy)

Sec) 20/11/35

20/11

Asst Member)

55 A notice to Mr K T Bhashyam to produce his promised documents within a fixed date say a month may first issue & the case posted f final disposal.

21/11

21/11

21/11

56 A/A Sabe

Gen 25/11

57) 25/11

No 662 of 1935 in the K. T. Bhashyam

GENERAL SEC 12 NOV 19 1935

OFFICE OF THE FIRST MEMBER 20 NOV. 1935 No. 3472

1299

(18)

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 152 of 1932 — [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

Iyengar Advocate Bangalore is calling for certain documents offered to be produced by him in connection with the case.

Gross 26/11

Mr. K. T. Narasiyam Iyengar Advocate for the petitioner producing documents called for —

58) The following are the papers presented to the Asst. Sec by the Advocate on 19.12.35:—

1) A file case containing copy of the Sannad called for —

2) A "To" Register of 1862 & 1863 Etc

The Sannad in original is not produced only a document stated the copy of it has been furnished.

59) For orders as to the date to which this enquiry posted — Reply para 53 & para.

(1.5 7.1.36)

(60) The copy of the Sannad is not an authenticated copy of the original Sannad. There is nothing in the copy of the Sannad to show that the Sri Parakala Matt is entitled to a share of the fees levied on sevas (or rokka vetcha as claimed by the Matt. It is entitled only to fees levied on honours (or so & so) whereon to go

7.1.36

(61) All this is unnecessary for at this stage.

8/1/36

It is res judicata that as the copy of the Sannad is not an authenticated & mentioned this and noted the facts bearing on the case contained in the Sannad. Since office manual requires that these should be stated with a view to note points for orders the calc-worker has also done so.

8/1

Yes there is the case so go by the ruling & note & note now

8/1

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—13-7 35

or దరఖాస్తు ఆలస్యం అయినట్లు కనుపడుచున్నది. submitted to the first Member's orders contained in para 55 of the notes

7.1.36

Mr. Bhashyam has produced
(1) a tri case copy of Sanad of 1830
(2) "To" deff of 1862-63 and
(3) a file of papers as enclosed to his petn dt 19.12.35 marked P.W.D II.

Orders are solicited re date of hearing

Refer:- I Member's orders at para 55 supra.

8/1/36

OFFICE OF THE FIRST MEMBER OF REVENUE 6806

I-

65 The case has been heard & the advocate was asked to produce certain documents which he has done. There is no need for further hearing.

66 The ~~case~~ case may now be noted upon on its merits

31/3

67)

1/4

11/4/36

68 Kind reference is invited to the orders at paras 39 to 41 supra. As per orders at

A Page of the notes

Serial No.

para 40 above Mr Meenakshi has produced (1) Copy of Sanad of 1830 (2) Tol Regr of Sri Parakali Mutt of 1862-63 and (3) a pile of papers as enclosures to his petn dt 19.12.35 (Pl. II).

69 The case is briefly as follows:—

Opponent Sriman Thenivirnoli Ramanujachar belongs to the family of Sthala Acharya Purushan of Melkote. In his petn. dt 15.7.31 he claimed certain privileges and this was referred to Mr. for report. In his letter dt 12/16.4.32 Mr (now the I member of Council) stated in paras 3 & 4 of the letter (Exhibit R) as follows:—

"I have considered the matter fully and agree with the D.C. that honours (i) (ii) & (iii) may be allowed. x x x x x x

70 As regards (ii) it is reported that payment of Rakhavecha is now imposed upon on the ground that the exemption is not mentioned in the Sanad granting the honours. There is evidence too to show that a Rakhavecha of Rs 2/- was being received from the petr's father even so far back as 1898. But a question arises as to whether the Arathi should not be done free when it is conferred as a mark of honour in the Sanad to a particular family. It seems to me that if fee is levied there would be no honour

x (i) Kutumba Tirtha
(ii) Exemption from payment of Rakha Vechha in respect of his ancestral Service
(iii) Adyapaka Pat.

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—13-7 35

attached because like any other person the petr. would be doing his as Sevakkar and paying the fixed Rekhakkedu also".

71 On this ~~[illegible]~~ Govt in their order Ds 5/7.5.32 (Ply M) approved of the recomm. of the Mr.

72 It is this order that is now sought to be reviewed by the Sri Parthasarathi Mutt. The main point urged by Mr. Bhashyam in support of the Sri Mutt's contention is that the consent of Sri Mutt had been obtained when exemption to the Sri Ahobila & Sri Varamangalam Mutts for payment of Rekha Vechuvu was allowed. The only document produced in support of this Sth is the To Regr. of Sri Parthasarathi Mutt for 1862-63 - The entrants from this Register which are copied are flagged C & B. It will be kindly seen therefrom that these are only intimations issued from time to time by the Sri Mutt to its Gumashtas or Agents as at Melkote. Even in one of these (Ply B) it is stated that the matter of exempting Sri Varamangalam Mutt from payment of Rekha Vechuvu was referred to H.H. Who ordered that action

Serial No.

may be taken in accordance with the wishes of H. H. the Maharajah of Travancore.

73 A third paragraph of the Proclamation of 1830 produced here shows that in item 16 thereof the following is mentioned:—

[illegible]

74 This can only refer to cases where Rekhaveeka is received and can by no stretch of imagination be taken to restrict the powers of Govt to sanction exemptions from payment of Rekhaveeka. On page 2 of the revision petition, the third ground urged is "that permission to appeal can only be granted on consent of petr of H. H. the Maharaja." Consent of Govt is consent of H. H. the Maharaja but how consent of petr is necessary in addition is by no means clear.

75) In view of the above it is for consideration whether the orders passed by Govt

43 vide 11
re: Certain Mary
Ramanujachariar of

File No. 152 of 1932

require to be ~~[illegible]~~ renewed as requested by the Sri Mutt.

14/4/36

Gen: Mary) 76) The Mutt is entitled to a s of Rokkavetcha where it is. This does not mean that it can grant the power to give exemption in cases in which this may be considered justified. If Rokkavetcha were levied and a share of it denied Mutt would have cause for complaint. It could have none in a case like this. It may become necessary to excuse the levy of the fee in other cases and Govt. as sole authority in control of temples should be free to show concessions in cases where this is called for.

16/4

First Member) 77) I agree. The order was passed by the previous First Member on my recommn as M.C. There is no reason to modify the order.

20/4

Dewan) 78) 21-4-36 21/4/36 21/4/36

GENERAL DEPT. 15 APR. 42
OFFICE OF THE FIRST MEMBER OF C.S. 17 APR. 1936
DEWAN'S OFFICE 21 APR. 1936 No. 6374

1299 / 1160 of 35-36 Mus Review 11 of 32-33 (22

General and Revenue Secretariat | Mus File No. 152 of 1932 | [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

By Subscribed & sworn before me Mr Jones
Crs 24.4.36

Sd) For personal appearance
24/4/36

24 April 769

Gen: Secy)

Gen
24/4/36

25/4/36

10 No. 1506 of 27.4.36 to the Advocate for the Review petitioner intimating that Govt see no reason to modify the orders already passed in the matter.

No 1507 of 27.4.36 to the Honorary Secretary of Sri Parakala Mutt forwarding copy of the above for information.

No 1508 of 27/4/36 to Sreepadathanja Thirumanamiah of Melkote forwarding copy of the above communication.

No 1509 of 27.4.36 to Mr T. S. Narasimha Ayengar Advocate for the Respondent forwarding copy of the above for information

No 1510 of 27.4.36 to Mr Thiruvirunelli Ramanujachar forwarding copy of the above letter.

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—13-7 35

Mag File No. 152 of 1932 General

No 1511 of 27.4.1936 to the Mysore Commissioner returning the records received from him on the subject.

B 2/6/36

Mus 152-32-1.

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT. 372 8 SEP 1932 MUZRAI.

T O LES

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE

MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

Muzrai Petition No. 4 of 1932-33.

PETITIONER.		OPPONENT.
SREE PARAKALA MUTT by Hon. Superintendant, SRINIVASARAGHAVACHAR, MYSORE.	-Vs-	THIRUVAIMOLI RAMANUJACHAR, MELKOTE.

The Petitioner abovenamed humbly and respectfully begs to state as follows:-

Facts of the Case.

According to the Sannad of 1830 corresponding to Vikrithi Samvathsara granted to the Petitioner Mutt by the late H. H. Sri Krishnaraja Wadiyar III, every one who performs Sevartha in Melkote Sri Narayanaswamy Temple - should pay to the Mutt as a mark of respect a sum of one Hana or Rs. 0. 4. 8 per sevartha. - This mamool has been observed up to date.

In or about 1862 the Ahobila Mutt and the Vananamamale Mutt prayed that they may be -- exempted from such payment. Owing to the fact that

that they were public institutions, they were exempted in respect of certain -- sevarthas; and the exemption was granted by consent of the Mutt on the one side and of His Highness the Maharaja on the other.

Petitioner learns that the opponent applied to the Government for such exemption in his case and that the same has been - granted by order dated

Petitioner humoly submits that the -- decision is ex parte this petitioner who is affected thereby and that the decision is - liable to be reviewed and set aside on the following:-

Grounds.

1. That the petitioner is entitled to receive Rokkavecha and cannot be deprived of the same unless by his consent.

2. That it was necessary to notify - petitioner before passing any orders in favour of opponent since the order affects petitioner.

3. That permission to opponent can only be granted on consent of petitioner and His - Highness the Maharaja.

4. That opponent is not entitled to - exemption and there are no grounds for such exemption.

5. That

5. That the order passed without notice to or hearing from petitioner is unjust and inequitable.

6. That the matter should be enquired into and the petitioner's right to Rokkavecha safeguarded.

7. That opponent has paid Rokkavecha up to and including last year and opponent's attempt is merely to thwart petitioner.

8. That opponent belongs to the -- Thengalai group who have been making no end of litigation against the Mutt which is of vadagalai persuasion.

9. That the order passed prejudices petitioner's rights and petitioner is -- seriously handicapped thereby.

10. That the order in question is - otherwise erroneous and unsustainable.

The Petitioner, therefore, humbly prays that the Rokkavecha exempted in opponent's case may be set aside and opponent held - liable to pay the Rokkavecha as hitherto.

The Petitioner, further most respectfully prays that a stay order may be granted in this behalf.

BANGALORE, 26. 9. 32.

ADVOCATE FOR PETITIONER.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read:-

Petition received at the General and Revenue Secretariat in December 1930 from Ved. Dirvaimole Ramanuja-char of Melkote in the matter of certain Maryades (privileges) claimed by him in the Sri Narayanaswamy temple at the place.

Correspondence in the matter ending with letter No. 860 of 1927-28 dated 12/16th April 1932 from the Munsiff Commissioner reporting that the marginally noted privileges are claimed by Ved. Ramanuja-char and recommended by the Sub Division Officer, French Rocks, after enquiry, that the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, has issued orders sanctioning all these and stating that for reasons given, the first three of them viz., Kutumba Theertha, exemption from payment of Rakkaneteha in respect of his Nelmini Swas and Adhyapaka post, might be conferred on the applicant, but that

1. Kutumba Tirtha.
2. Exemption from payment of Rakkaneteha in respect of Nelmini Swas.
3. Adhyapaka post and
4. Grant of Padiamsa.

the claim for Padianna has and should be rejected.

Order No. 1616/Muzr 2-30-38

Dated, Bangalore the 7th May 1932.

The Muzrai Commissioner's recommendation is approved.

Sd/ B. Muddukrishnappa

For Secretary to Government
Financial Department.

Copying fee 0-6-0
Engraving fee 0-1-6
Total 0-7-6

R. Dis 141/31-32 dated 18-5-32

Memo.

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, with reference to correspondence ending with his letter No. N. 553/27 dated 30.11-31. Enclosures are returned.

Sd/ D. Ramaiya
For Muzrai Commissioner.

Copy applied on 17-8-32
" ready on 17-8-32
" delivered on 18.8.32
No. of Words 279.

R. N. 553/27
on file.

Memo.

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Sub Division office, French Rocks for information and necessary action. The enclosures are returned. Any vacant post of Adhyapaka Baraward should be given to as ordered by Government and registered in the baraward.

Sd/ K. Mallarajaiah
For Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

S/ 1-6-1932

compared.

" Copy "

Before the Honourable ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ
Maharaja's Mysore Bangalore

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

1932—1933 ನೇ Heyrai petn ನಂಬರು

ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್		ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅಪೊನೆಂಟ್
Sree Parakala Hutta by Hon. Superintendent Srinivasa Raghavachar	Vs	Shirumaimoli Ramanujachar

ಮಃ ರಾ॥ ಕೆ. ಟಿ. ಭಾಷ್ಯಂಅಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್, ಬಿ. ಎ., ಬಿ. ಎಲ್., ಮತ್ತು
ಎಂ. ಶೇಷಾದ್ರಿ, ಬಿ. ಎ, ಎಲ್.ಎಲ್. ಬಿ. ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್ಸ್‌ರವರಿಗೆ

..... P.S. Ramaiah ..... ಬರೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮಾ

ಈ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ವರವಾಗಿ ಆವೈರುವರಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನನ್ನ ವರವಾಗಿ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ, ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರೀಕ್ರಮ ನಡೆಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲುಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಪ್ರೋಸೆಸ್‌ಸ್ಟಾಂಪು, ದಾವಾಸ್ಟಾಂಪು ಸಹ ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಕೇಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ಯಾವ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಖದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೂ ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡೆಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು } ರುಜು ಶ್ರೀ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಹಾರಾಜ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಪರಕಾಲ ಮಠಾಧಿಪತಿಗಳು

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.
ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್ಸ್

ಯಜಮಾನ ಅ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ.

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇಧೇನೆ.
K. T. Bhashyam Iyengar
ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟ್ಸ್ for P.S. Ramaiah
26. 9. 32

646 One one petn with its enclosures.
Mez
152-32-2

24th October 32

The

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

I am directed to forward herewith for early report with records an application dated the 26th September 1932 received from the Superintendent, Sri Parakala Mutt, Mysore, requesting that Government Order No.1616/Muzrai 2-30-88 dated the 5th/7th May 1932, exempting Ved. Thiruvaimoli Ramanujachariar from paying Rokkavecha in respect of his nehimi sevas at the Sri Narayanaswami temple at Melkote ~~temple~~ ~~ex~~ may be set aside.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(to be returned with the reply).

For Financial Secretary to Government.

ASH.2.

ix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Inam

File No. 152-32

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to 372

No. 646 Inam Settlement

To The Inam Cir. Bangalore

General and Revenue Secretariat

(Inam)

the 193 .

Date of issue 24/10/32

Signed by Mr B. Muddukrishnappa

(to be returned with reply)

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith for ~~[illegible]~~ report with records, ~~and~~ an application dated the 26th Sept 1932 received from the Superintendent, Sri Parthasarathi Swami Temple, requesting that G.O. No 1616/Inam, 2-30-88 dated the 5th/7th July 1932,

exempting V.C.A.
Thummadimoli Ramunja
Charias ~~of~~ from paying
Rothkaucha in respect
of his schimi pensas
at the Sri Narayana
Swami temple at
Trichur may be
dealt with

Thanks

21/10/32

Mr J.C. Neg Ag Comr
C.E. Dn
20/10/32

Mos 152-32-3

5th November 1932.

S. Shamanna, Esquire, B.A.,

K.T. Bhashyam Iyengar, Esquire, B.A., B.L.,
Advocate, Arlepet, Bangalore City.

With reference to the application dated the 26th September 1932 from the Superintendent, Sri Paramalaswami Mutt, presented by you, requesting that Government Order dated the 5th/7th May 1932, exempting Vedamurthi Thiruvoimoli Ramanujachariar from paying Rokkavecha in respect of his nehime sevas at the Sri Narayanaswami temple at Melkote, may be set aside etc., I am directed to state that the matter is receiving attention. Your request for a stay order cannot however be granted.

I have the honor to be,
S i r ,
Your most obedient servant,

for Financial Secretary to Government.

4

G—1]

T .....

.....

.....

Section Immyan

File No. 152 32

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to 372

No. 739

To M. T. Bhashyam Iyengar B.A., B.L., Advocate, Cuttanpet, Pondicherry City

General and Revenue Secretariat

(Immyan)

the *193*

Date of issue 8/11/32

Sir,

Signed by Dr B. Ms. Sadakrishnaiyer

With reference to application dated 26th Sept. 1932 from the Superior Sri Parakala Mt represented by you, requesting that G.O. order dated 5th/7th May 1932, exempting Vidi Thirumalai Ramanaya Chetty & Sons from

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

vikramacha in respect
Velimi Senas
Vritti is Narayana
ana temple at
Trichur may be
left undecided I
intended to state
at the matter is
element of urgency
your request for a stay order cannot however
be granted.

~~The matter is prayed for~~

[illegible]

4/11/32

For DC Secy to Govt
C.E.S. [illegible]
31/10/32

36

Mus 157. 32-4

No. 27/32-33
Eve 2 files

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE.

Dated, Bangalore, 22 December 193 22

FROM

S. HIRIANNAIYA, ESQ., M.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT.
723
26. DEC. 1932
MUZRAI.

FINANCIAL SECRETARY
23 DEC. 1932
No.

To

C. Shamanna, Esq., I.A.S.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore.
Finance and Commerce Department.

SIR,

In reference to your letter No. [illegible] dated 24-10-32 [illegible] for [illegible] the [illegible] applications [illegible] the [illegible] forwarded [illegible] from [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] were herewith the entire [illegible] of papers [illegible] above [illegible] to state [illegible] planned in this office letter No. [illegible] dated [illegible] 1932 addressed to you [illegible] the Mysore [illegible] sioner's letter of 30th November 1931, a copy of which [illegible] already been sent.

2. The enclosures to your letter [illegible] collector [illegible] and return.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

S. Hiriannaiya

[illegible]

4317/37

Mog 155-35-5

Presented by Mr K.T. Bhashyam

TWO RUPEES

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS

THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

Mus. Petn. No. of 1932-33.

Petitioner.		Opponent.
Sree Parakala Mutt by Honorary Superintendent SRINIVASA-RAGAVACHAR, MYSORE.	-Vs-	Thiruvaimoli RAMANUJACHAR, MELKOTE.

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT 745 6 - JAN 33 MYSORE.

The Petitioner begs to state as follows:-

1. That contrary to mamool and to the established usage, opponent has by misrepresentation obtained an exparte order depriving the petitioner's right of recovering Rokkavecha on occasions of sevartha by him.

2. That exemption granted to him is highly derogatory to the dignity of the Sree Parakala Mutt; and is besides illegal, exparte, and based on misrepresentations by opponent who had tried - similarly and was declared disentitled by Government Order dated 29.1.1910.

3. That the Mutt has already on 26. 9. 32 filed a petition before this Hon'ble Government for cancellation of the order.

4. That

4. That he Sevartha by opponent comes off on 8th of this month; and if at that function Rokkavecha is not paid to petitioner by opponent it would be seriously impairing the respect, - dignity and influence of the Mutt.

5. That if a Stay Order is not - granted and the Status quo maintained until disposal of the petition, the Mutt will be greatly prejudiced and subjected to loss of esteem and respect.

6. That the Mutt has no objection to the entire matter being considered and disposed of early.

The Petitioner, therefore, most - humbly and respectfully prays that a stay order may be passed and the case disposed of early.

BANGALORE, 4th Jan 33.

ADVOCATE FOR PETITIONER.

O RUPEES

GENL & FEV. SECRETARIAT
737
5 - JAN 1933
MUZRAI.

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGNESS THE

MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

Muzrai 152-32-6

Muzrai Petition No. of 32-33.

Petitioner.		Opponent.
SRIPADATHANGI TIRU-NARANIAH, residing in MELKOTE, Seerangapatam Taluk, Mysore District.	-Vs-	TIRUVAIDOLU RAMANUJA JEAR, residing in Devamba Agrahar, MYSORE.

The Petitioner abovenamed begs to state as follows:-

1. That he and his ancestors have been doing duties in the Sri Narayanaswamy Temple at Melkote, as Sri Padathangis and receiving as such cash honourarium known as Rokka Vechha at every Sevartha in the Temple.

2. That the opponent is one of those who perform Sevarthas in the temple and from time immemorial he and his ancestors have been paying Rokkavechha to the petitioner.

3. That petitioner learns that the opponent applied to the Government for exemption from payment of Rokkavechha and that he has been granted the exemption.

4. That

4. That p titioner had no notice of the opponent's application. nor was he heard in the matter.

5. That it is highly inequitable to deprive the petitioner of his right without hearing him or giving him any notice.

6. That opponent is neither legally entitled to nor equitably fit and worthy of any exemption from the payment which has been the mamool for generations.

7. That there are public recordsdisproving opponent's claim particularly the order of Government dated 29-1-1910.

8. That the payment of Rokksvechha is more and essentially in the nature of an honour than an emolument and petitioner humbly submits that the non-payment of the same would be derogatory to the respect and dignity attaching to his duties as Sripadathangi.

The Petitioner therefore, humbly prays that the order exempting opponent from payment of Rokkavechha may be set aside.

The Sevartha by the opponent comes of on the 8th instant and since the long established mamool is affected by the order, petitioner most humbly and respectfully prays that a stay order may be granted and

Status

Status quo maintained pending final orders of Government.

BANGALORE,
5. 1. 33.

Petitioner

ADVOCATE FOR PETITIONER.

In the High Court of Mysore

BANGALORE.

Miscellaneous Section NO. OF 1932–1933.

Sripadarao ... Thimmaraiah **VS.** Thimmappa ... Ramappa

Messrs. K. T. BHASHYAM IYENGAR, B.A., B.L., & M. SESHADRI, B.A., LL.B.,
Advocates

.....the Petr. .. abovenamed do hereby nominate and appoint the said advocates in the above case and do hereby empower the said advocates to appear for and on .... behalf in the above case, to take all steps which may be necessary on .. ..behalf arising out of or in connection with the above case either during progress or after its decision to sign and subscribe their names to any document which they may deem proper to execute any decree that may be passed in .... favour and to receive out of the Court any refund of money which may be lodged or become payable or receivable on ....behalf and on receipt thereof to grant receipts or other sufficient discharges for the same, to withdraw, compromise or refer to arbitration the said case to appoint one or more substitute or substitutes and to act and perform all other matters and things relating thereto or connected therewith, to represent..... in matters relating to the same and to act as fully and effectually to all intents and purposes as .... might do if personally present and did the same. And —do hereby agree to pay all fees, costs, charges and expenses which may be incurred and to allow, ratify, and to confirm whatsoever the said Advocates shall lawfully do or cause or procure to be done by virtue of these presents.

Accepted

Signed before me by the executant who is known to me

Advocate

Advocates for

5-1-33.

1039
Mey 152-32 7

13th Jan.
1933.

Dear Sir,

With reference to petitions dated 4th January 1933 and 5th January 1933, filed by you on behalf of Sri Parakala Mutt praying for a stay order in the matter of Bokkavecha due from Mr. Tiruvaimole Ramanuja Char of Mysore, I am directed to refer you to this office Endorsement No.739 of 5th November 1932 addressed to you in the matter and to state that there is no reason for reconsidering the orders already passed.

Yours faithfully,

For Secretary to Government,
Financial Department.

To
Mr. K.T. Bhashyam Iyengar, B.A., B.L.,
Advocate, Cottonpet,
Bangalore City.

K.T.R.2/13-1-33.

F G—1]

CT .....

Section [illegible]

File No. 152 / 32

Serial No. 7

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. ~~152~~ 1039

To

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Mr K. T. Bhashyam Iyengar,
Advocate Coimbatore
Rangachariar

Date of issue 13/1/32

Signed by B. Muthukrishnamachari

Dear Sir,

With reference to your petitions of 4.1.33 & 5.1.33 filed by you on behalf of Sri Parakala Mutt for a stay order in the matter of Ramanuja Das for the Tiruvaimozhi Ramanujachari, I regret, I have directed to invite your attention to this fact. Each petition of S.N. 32 in the matter is to the effect that there is no reason for revision. The orders already passed.

Yours faithfully,
[illegible]
13-1-33

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

WD 71—GBPM—40,000—20-7-31.

[illegible] 11/1/33

TWO RUPEE

IN THE COURT OF

Before the Govt of Mysore

No. of 19 19

Plaintiff, Appellant Review No 11 of 32-33

Complainant, Petitioner Pl Vs Sri Parakala Mathu

Versus

Defendant, Respondent Opp Jiruvai Modi Ramanujachar

Accused, Opponent

The Opponents above named do hereby nominate and appoint Mr. T. G. NARAYANA AIYENGAR, B. A., B. L., to be my Advocate in the above suit, appeal or case and I do hereby empower my said Advocate to appear for me on my behalf in the above suit, appeal or case to take all or any steps which may be necessary on my behalf arising out of, or in connection with the above suit, appeal or case either during their progress or after their decision; to sign and subscribe his name to any document which he may deem proper; to receive out of the said court any sum of money which may be lodged or become payable or receivable on my behalf, and on receipt there of to grant receipts or other sufficient discharges for the same; to withdraw, compromise or refer to arbitration the said suit, appeal or case to appoint one or more substitute or substitutes, and to act and perform all other matters and things relating to or connected therewith, to represent me in all matters relating to the same and to act in the premises as fully and effectually to all intents and purposes, as I might do if personally present and did the same. And I do hereby agree to pay all fees, costs, charges and expenses which may be incurred and to allow, ratify and confirm all things whatsoever my said Advocate shall lawfully do or cause or procure to be done in the premises by virtue of these presents and also to put in applications for the setting aside of exparte decrees or orders or for the restoration of proceedings in suit etc. if dismissed for default and to receive all cheques and refunds from the court that may become payable to me.

In witness where of I have here unto set my hand this day of 19

Accepted

T. G. Narayana Aiyangar

Advocate for

5. 4. 33

Signed before me by the executant who is known to me.

T. G. Narayana Aiyangar

Advocate for

46

17th April
18th

1478 Send the file
Mis 152-32-8

The

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No. 427/32-33 dated the 22nd December 1932 forwarding records connected with the appeal filed by Sri Parakala Mutt in the matter of exempting Thiruvaimuli Ramanujachar from paying rokkavecha in respect of his nehime sevas in Sri Narayanaswami temple at Melkote, I am directed to request you to be so good as to furnish information at a very early date on the following points:-

(1) Apart from Sri Ahobala and Sri Vanamamalai Mutts, are any other Mutts or individuals exempted from the payment of fees for sevas performed by them and if so, what is the authority for such exemption?

(2) In his report dated the 16th May 1931 the Sub Division Officer makes the following statement:-

" From enquiries made in the temple office to-day, I was given to understand that Aralapad is now being done free to Paricharaks, Staniks and Sripada thangis when specified sevas are being done by them and by Sri Parakala Mutt. Does this mean that all these persons or institutions are allowed to perform sevas without the payment of prescribed fees?

(3) Are there any cases in which though fees are re

recovered for sevas, no share of them is paid to Sri Parakala Mutt?

(4) Is Arulapadu an honor shown only to Sevarthakaras or also to others like Heads of Mutts or Acharya Purushas on occasions on which the latter themselves are not Sevarthakaras?

(5) Is Aralapad a separate function different from Sevartha with a fee prescribed therefor or is it only a function which is part of a sevartha?

Records received with your letter are herewith returned for reference and retransmission.

I have the honor to be,
S i r ,
Your most obedient servant,

For Secretary to Government,
Sd/- Financial Department

P.H.

F G—1]

CT .....

.....

.....

Section Misc

File No. 152-32

Serial No. 8

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. 1478 Encl 2 files

To

The M.C

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 18-4-33

Signed by Muddukrishnappa

Sir,

With reference to the correspondence ending with letter No 427/12-338 dt 22/12/32 forwarding records connected with the appeal filed by Sri Panchala Mall in his malkiyat claiming Thiruvamulai Kanmanpillai for having robbed the in respect of his relative Seetas in Sri Venkatanarasimha Swamy temple at Melukote, I am directed to request you to be so good as to furnish information at a very early date on the following

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

1) Apart from Sri Ahobala & Sri Vanamamalai Mutts, are any other mutts or individuals exempted from the payment of fees for Sevas performed by them and if so what is the authority for such exemption?

2) In his report of 16/5/31 the S.D.O makes the following statement:-

"From enquiries made in the temple office today, I was given to understand that Anulapad is now being done free to Parichanaks, Ramtks & Sri-Prde-Thangis when specified Sevas are being done by them & by Sri Parakala Mutt."

Does this mean that all these persons or institutions are allowed to perform Sevas without the payment of prescribed fees?

3) Are there any cases in which, though fees are

R. S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

received for Seras, no share of them is pd to Sri Parakala Mutt?

4) Is Arulapadu an honour - shown only to Sevarthakaras or also to others like heads of Mutts or Acharyapurushas on occasions on which the latter themselves are not Sevarthakaras?

5) Is Arulapadu a separate function different from Sevarthakarta & fee prescribed therefor is only a function which is part of Sevarthakarta?

Answers to your letter are herewith respectfully for orders & orders thereon.

[illegible]

GPB—20,000—7-7-14

[illegible] 14/1

[illegible] 14/1

Mu 152-32-9 51

No. 427 Eve Reserve 32-33

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER,
IN MYSORE,

Dated, Bangalore, 28th 193

FROM

N. MADHAVA RAO, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

1299

To

.....
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
.....*Department.*

SIR,

[illegible]

[illegible]

52

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

No. 662 Muz 152-32.

Dated, Bangalore, 25th 26 Novr. 193 5

From

The *General Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

Mr. K. T. Bhashyam Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Advocate, Cottonpet,
Bangalore City.

Sir

Subject:- Muzrai Review ~~petition~~ Case No.11 of 1932-33 between Sri Parakalaswami Mutt and the counter-petitioners Thiruvoimuli Ramanujachar of Melkote in the matter of certain maryades shown to the latter in Melkote Sri Narayanaswami Temple.

Dear Sir,

I am desired to state that when the above muzrai case was heard on 5th April 1933 you stated that the consent of the Sri Paraka Mutt had been obtained for allowing exemption to Sri Ahobila and Sri Vanamamalai Mutts from the payment of Rokkavecha and offered to - produce the connected documents. You also wanted to produce the - sannad of 1830 giving this privilege to Sri Parakalaswami Mutt. I am to state that these documents have not been produced thus far - though more than 2½ years have elapsed and to request that the above said documents may be produced before the 26th December 1935 without fail.

Yours faithfully,

For General Secretary to Government.

bnl.2

2 Colls

Section Misc.
File No. 152-32
Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to 1275

No 662

To
Mr. K. T. Bhashyam Iyengar Esq. B.A. B.L.
Advocate, Cottapet
Bangalore City

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
the 193 .

Subj:— Mug Review Case No 11 of 1932-33 between Sri Parakalaswami Mutt & the Counterpetitioner Thiruvoi Muli Ramanujachar of Melkote in the matter of certain mangadas shown to the latter in Melkote Sri Narayana Swami for fee.

Date of issue 26-11-1935

Signed by Mr. B. Muddukrishnappa

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

Dear Sir,

I am desired to state that when the above Mug Case was heard on 5/4

Paramalayam had been obtained

for allowing exemption to Sri

Abobala & Sri Vamamalai Mudli

from the payment of Rokkavaala & offered to produce connected documents.

& you also ~~offered~~ wanted to produce

the Sanad of 1830 giving

this privilege to Sri Paramala Swami

Mudli. I am ~~and~~ to request that

the above said Documents

may ~~then~~ be produced ~~within~~ before the 26th Dec-1935 &

~~a week from this date~~ fail.

Yours faithfully

[illegible]

~~For Sign~~ Sec

G.S
25/11

Mus 468
35-36

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS

THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

Muz. Appeal No. 11 of 1926-27.

Presented by Mr. Bhashyam in person with a his case Cents Copy of Sanad of 1830 and the Tot of the Sri Parakal Mutt for the year 1862-63
19/12/35

PLAINTIFF.		RESPONDENT.
SRI PARAKALA MUTT by Lord SRINIVASA RAGHAVACHAR.	-V/S-	THIRUVONMOLI RAMANUJACHAR.

[illegible] to protect [illegible] the documents [illegible] to be [illegible] by him [illegible] to be as follows :-

1. In the temple of Sri [illegible] at Melkote [illegible] the [illegible] school [illegible] performance [illegible] or a cash payment to the extent of [illegible] to the appellant [illegible] of 1000 [illegible] Brahmanas [illegible] the appellant [illegible] from every [illegible].

2. The [illegible] of [illegible] to the [illegible] of the [illegible], [illegible] as follows :- [illegible] "[illegible]"

means " in cash" that is payment in cash. It provides for no exception and grants the right to receive this cash payment from all Sevarthakaras. It is an honour conferred by His Highness on his guru. It would be erroneous to interpret the words to mean "if any cash payment is made, then out of such payment"; because it would - make the honour to the guru of the Royal Household precarious and liable to be - defeated which certainly could not have been intended by His Highness; or if such was his intention the words would have been "ఖర్చుపెట్టిన డబ్బు" or "out of cash payment". The - difference between "ఖర్చుడబ్బు" and "ఖర్చుపెట్టిన డబ్బు" is obvious. The latter might mean "out of cash payment if any", the former peremptorily means "in cash".

3. The Sannad in original is produced herewith and will be taken back with permission for production in Mysore in connection with - another case.

4.(a)The contention that this Sannad is not genuine cannot be sustained in view of G. O. No.3431-40 Muz. 1-10-28 dated 2.4.1921 wherein the Government in passing final orders on the question of certain honours pertaining to the Mutt in the Temple have relied upon - and strongly supported the Sannad in its - minutest details. In fact Government were pleased to warn the subordinates against be-littling any of the provisions of the Sannad.

(b) As far back as on 27th March 1862 the Amildar of Attikuppa has also relied on the Sanned and directed the temple authorities to act in strict accordance with the provisions of it.

(c) The provisions of the Sanned are being acted upon and enforced in the temple eversince the date of the Sanned which could not have been the case and not the Sanned - been genuine.

5. If "rukk vecha" means "out of such cash payments as may be made" the authority to exempt such payments would have to be - - looked. So he is not declared. In it His Highness or the Raja or the Government? There are instances of such exemption and all of them have been granted by the Mutt. The Ahobila Mutt claimed exemption. The Mutt granted it. The letter from the Mutt addressed to its agent in the temple is filed Ex.8 today; and office copy of it is maintained in the - Dairy produced herewith. It recites that the Ahobila Mutt prays for exemption and that on account of its being a public institution the Mutt grants the exemption. So also the letter of Dhundhubi Sevana Sudha Initiation granting exemption to Vanar malai Mutt. The relevant words are as follows:- శ్రీవారమాలలిలు తదింద శ్రీమ-
లువరాయుస్వామియవలంగే మంత్రవ్రతి సేవార్థడి
సకర్తదల్లి మఠదాయదారు శాసనాంకిత బిరుదరశేకు
కుం గారు ప్రకారచేళ్ళవిక్ష-బహుణబళువంధాద్ద
క్కే లూగనదరిమఠక్కే ముఖ్యశిష్యరాదద్రంబళిళ
క్కే-శంక్రాంతిప్రకారాగి సదరిమఠదింద క్రయంకర్తమంత

ಪ್ರಸ್ತುತ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆ-ಕೆಳಗಿನ
ಬಿಡಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಶ್ರೀಗಳವರ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ
ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂಬದಾಗಿ ಕೃಷ್ಣಸ್ವಾಮಿದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದ ಸುಜೀ
ದಾರಿಯಾದ ಹಾಲಪ್ಪದಶರಂಗಾಚಾರ್ಯರವರು ಹಿನ್ನಿಗೆ
ಗಡಬಾರದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡದ್ದರಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀಗಳವರು ಶ್ರೀಗಳವರ
ಸನ್ನಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷ್ಣಾಚಾರ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿದ್ದಲ್ಲದೆ ಸದರಿಪ್ರ
ಕರಣ ಶಿಂಗ್ರೆಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ರವರಿಗೂ ಸದ್ಭಕ್ತಿ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆಗಳಿಂ
ದಿರ್ಕೊಂಡದ್ದುಕೊಂಡು ಸದರಿ ವಾದಮಾಮಲಿ
ಮತಿದಶಿಷ್ಟರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಸುಚಾರ್ಯರೆಂಬವರುಗಳು
ಸದರಿ ಶಿಂಗ್ರೆಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ರಮಾಂತಿಗೆ ಕಳಿಸಿ ವಿಚಾರ
ಕತ್ತಿಗಳವರು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸಹಾಯ
ಸಂಗತಿ ಹುಬೂರು ಮಠಾನ್ವಯದಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಅರಿತಿಮಾ
ಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿಕೊಂಡದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಶ್ರೀಗಳವರಿಗೆ ಕ್ರಾಮಸಾರದಲಿ
ನಳ್ಳಿದೆಂಬದಾಗಿ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಯಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂ
ದ ಸದರಿ ವಾದಮಾಮಲಿ ಮತಿದ್ವಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ
ರಿಂದ ಸದರಿ ಮಠದಿಂದ ದಿನಕ್ಕೆ ಮಂಜಾನ್ನ
ದಿನೆಂದ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ದಿಯಬೇಕಿಯಾದ
ಮಾಂಡಿಕೆ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆ-ದಕ್ಷಿಣಾದ್ರ್ಯ-ಕೆಗಡುಕ್ತಿ
ಳ್ಳ ಕೆಲಸದಲ್ಲಿ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀಶ್ರೀಗಳವರಿಗೆ
ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುವದರಿಂದ ಅಪೀಲಿಗೆ ದಿಕ್ಕಿಸಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ

6. (a) It will thus be clear that exemptions have been granted on the highness in consideration which the appellant will. [illegible] institutions, the mobilisation [illegible] Vanaramalai [illegible] state [illegible]

who have been similarly exempted in view of their being always employed in the - service of the temple no sevarthakara is exempt from payment of rokkavecha. Every-one has to pay.

(b) It was suggested that Chikkiah, Raja Wadiyar and one Kumaram of Mandya do not pay rokkavecha. The suggestion is - false and erroneous. The appellant Mutt receives rokkavecha in sevas by these persons who have made endowments or "ಶ್ರೀದುವಚ್ಚ". The sevas are conducted by the Government on - their behalf just as in all other cases of endowment and Government pay the Mutt the rokkavecha due in respect of the sevas. The suggestion that they are exempt is made with a view to show that respondent's claim for similar exemption is not novel or extraordinary while really it is such.

7. The respondent's claim is based on a Sannad dated 30. 10. 1829 wherein it is alleged that respondent should be shown the honour of "Arulappadu."

(a) In the first place this honour has nothing to do with the subject - matter of appeal, namely payment of rokkavecha. There is nothing in it to suggest that respondent is entitled to Arulappadu, only at the time of - Sevas by him. It is cited along with Thirtha and Thirumalai which are part

of

of [illegible] honours and not such as pertain only to occasions of sevas conducted by him. Hence it could have no reference to payment of rokkavecha which is incidental only to Sevas.

(b) Secondly, the Sannad of 1830 in appellant's favour granting without exception the right of recovering rokkavecha from every Sevarthakara supersedes the former and respondent cannot resist the right of the appellant.

(c) Thirdly, the Sannad itself cannot be true or genuine since it has neither been referred to nor acted upon at any time by any person in authority. The pattis of the temple showing recovery of rokkavecha from the respondent family belie the sanned. The pattis prepared by the Curator of the Fund in the temple are produced herewith. So also the patti or book signed by Peishkar Mr. B. Gopala Rao. Entries therein prove recovery of rokkavecha from respondent's family.

(d) Lastly, the respondent's father Thiruvorimoli Thirunaranien Jai has himself admitted that rokkavecha is being paid by him; vide deposition of Thirunarana Jongal on 1.8.1898 before the Collector

of Frech Rocks Sub Taluk. The mamool or custom has been to - recover rokkavecha from respondent's family; and this has been so, for more than a century after the alleged Sannad.

8. The respondent's last contention is that he is a respected Acharya Purusha and may therefore be exempted as a mark of honour.

(a) There are many other Acharya - Purushas, some of whom are held in such high esteem that they are - shown special honours and are given priority over the respondent's - family. All of them pay rokkavecha.

(b) The respondent's family attempted to encroach upon and claim for themselves properties belonging to Ahobila Mutt putting forward a false claim that - they were descendants of the Ahobila Mutt founder. The Sub Judge M. C. Srinivasachariar rejected their claim as false and granted decrees against them in O.S.No.019 of 1886. In the Chief Court Messrs. C. G. Iluer C.J. and T. R. A. Thumboo Chetty J. confirmed the decision against the respondent's family in S.A.No.63 of 1888.

(c) The respondent's family put forward a claim based on a Sannad of 1775. -

Tamrub

Manmatha Asweeja Sudda Dwadasi, alleging therein that they were descendants of Adivan Satagopa Swami and must be shown similar honours. The relationship was held to be false and the Sannad being equally false was never - acted upon.

(d) The respondent's family put forward another Sannad dated 26.8.1812 alleging that it was granted by - His Highness Sri Krishnaraja Wadiyar III declaring the respondent's family entitled to honours like Vembar - - Iyengar. They produced a copy - - containing the words " వంశ పారంపర్య వాడి ". The alleged original does does not contain these words which had been interpollated in the copy to secure perpetuity of honours in the family. The Sannad itself has remained inoperative because it was not genuine. Besides Vembar Iyengar family pay rokkavecha and if the - Sannad is true, respondent cannot claim exemption.

9. The report of Peishkar Mr. B. Tairumala Char No.281/329 dated 28.12.1896 makes it clear that the respondent's family is from time to - time setting up false and untenable claims against the appellant Mutt. The report is available in the records.

10. The

10. The respondent performs - only one Nehimi Seva that is the fifth Seva of the Kotara Ootsava every year. It is submitted that respondent is not entitled to the exemption claimed since such exemption would be (a) a derogation of the right of the Sree Parakala Mutt (b) contrary to the Sannad of 20.8.1830 (c) opposed to mamool and (d) inequitable and invidious.

It is prayed that the exemption claimed by the respondent may not be granted and - that the ancient and continuous mamool of recovering Rokkavecha from respondent may be maintained and protected.

BANGALORE, 19. 5. 33.

ADVOCATE FOR APPELLANT.

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS

THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

Muz. Appeal No. 11 of 32-33.

APPELLANT.		RESPONDENT.
SREE PARAKALA MUTT.	-Vs-	THIRUVOIMOLI RAMANUJACHAR.

Memo of documents produced by the Sree Parakala Mutt.

1. Office copy of letter dated 15.8.1862 from the Sree Parakala Mutt to its Gumastha in Melkote temple exempting the Ahobila Mutt from payment of Rokkavetcha. (Diary).

2. Office copy of letter dated [illegible] from the Sree Parakala Mutt to its Gumastha in the Melkote temple - exempting the Vanamamalai Mutt from payment of Rokkavetcha. (Diary).

3. True copy of letter dated 30.7.1862 addressed to the Melkote Temple Authorities by Subedar Andapuram Rangachar stating that as per instructions of the Mutt exemption has been - recognised.

4. True copy granted by the Taluk Authorities of the order of the Amildar of Attikuppe Taluk - directing

directing the temple authorities to recover Rokkavetcra in all cases of Sevartha relying on the Sannad of 1830.

5. Office copy of the deposition of Thiruvaimoli Thirunaranienga, father of the present respondent, stating before the Amildar of Frech Rocka Sub Taluk that he is paying Rokkavetcha on all occasions of Sevartha. Original is in the records before Government.

6. Rokkavetcha collection pattis submitted by the Gumastha of the Sree Para-Kala Mutt in the Melkote temple showing - receipt of rokkavetcha from respondent's family. Five pattis.

7. Rokkavetcha collection pattis for 1927, 1928 and 1929 showing payment of rokka-vetcha by respondent's family and signed by the Peishkar Mr. B. Gopal Rao of the Temple.

8. Government Order of 1921 holding Sannad of 1830 to be genuine.

9. Sannad of 1830.

10. Copies of Judgment of Sub Court and High Court.

11. Report of Vivekollasini Sabha for 1952.

12. "To" Dairy of the appellant Mutt.

Original documents have to be summoned from the temple at Melkote.

BANGALORE, [illegible]

19. 5. 53. ADVOCATE FOR APPELLANT.

1862-63 సంవత్సరపు "శిస్తు" వసూళ్ళు

72
గ

శ్రీ కనకపురం పరగణాలో 15 గ్రామాలు కలిపి ఒక తాలూకాగా ఏర్పాటు చేసి, ఆ తాలూకాకు తహశీల్దారుగా నియమించబడిన నేను, ఆ తాలూకాలో ఉన్న గ్రామాల పటేళ్ళను పిలిపించి, వారి సమక్షంలో గ్రామాల వారీగా వసూళ్ళు చేయవలసిన శిస్తు వివరాలు తెలియజేసి, వసూళ్ళు చేయడానికి తగిన ఏర్పాట్లు చేయమని ఆదేశించాను. ఆ ఆదేశాలకు అనుగుణంగా పటేళ్ళు తమ తమ గ్రామాలకు వెళ్ళి, రైతులకు తెలియజేసి, వారి వారి పొలాలకు సంబంధించిన శిస్తు వివరాలు తెలియజేసి, వసూళ్ళు చేయడానికి తగిన ఏర్పాట్లు చేయడం జరిగింది. ఆ తరువాత

1862-63 సంవత్సరపు "క" నుండి వ్రాయబడినది -

67

కవరు నెం. 72

శిలాలేఖనాలలో కొలతలు గల గ్రామాల పేర్లు వివరాలు

మండలాల్లో సంవత్సరాల వారీగా వివరాలు
(1862-63)

[illegible]

"copy"

[illegible]

తేది. 15-5-33

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

No 1506/Reg/152-32-40 **General and Revenue Secretariat,**

Dated Bangalore, 25th April 19 27

FROM

The Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

To

Mr. M. T. Bhashyam Iyengar, B.A., B.L.,
Advocate, Cottonpet, Bangalore City.

SIR

XXX

Dear Sir,

With reference to petition dated 26.3.1932 filed by you on behalf of Sri Parakala Mutt, Mysore and petition dated 5.1.1933 on behalf of Sri Sadathangi Tirunarayana of Melkote requesting that Government Order No.1710/Ag.-5 dated 7th May 1932 so far as it applies to Ved. Thiruvonamali Ramanujachariar of Melkote being exempted from the payment of Tonkuvecha for his rehima seva in the temple of Sri Bangalaswami at Melkote be set aside and the subsequent petition dated 1.12.1933 on the same subject furnishing additional information, I am directed to inform you that Government see no reason to modify the orders passed in the matter. The enclosures received on 1.12.1933 are herewith returned. Their receipt may kindly be acknowledged.

Yours faithfully,

For Secretary to Government.

G.S.

No 1507 of 27.4.36 to the Hon. Superintendent of Sri Parakala Mutt.

No 1508 of 27.4.36 to Sri Sadathangi Thirunarayana of Melkote

No 1509 of 27.4.36 to the T.S. Narayana Iyengar Advocate for the respondent

No 1510 of 27.4.36 to Thiruvonamali Ramanuj

No 1511 of 27.4.36 to the Inam Commissioner — returning the records received from him on the 1st,

UBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mug

File No. 152-32

Serial No. 10

No. 1506

Diary No. of letter replied to 1259/34-35

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue 27-4-36 (1)

P.W.D. I

Signed by Mr. B. Nadhakrishnappa

for for 5.1.33 on behalf

To

Mr. Krishnaswamy Iyengar Bar-at-Law

Advocate Counsel

Bangalore City.

Dear Sir,

With reference to petition dt. 26.9.32 filed by you on behalf of Sri Parakala Mutt Sripadaratanji Tirumalarajah of Melkote Mysore requesting that Government no. 1616/Mug 3-30-88 dt. 5th May 1932 so far as it applies to Vidwan Thiruvoimoli Ramanuja Chariar of Melkote being exempted from the [illegible] of Rokhalnaidu [illegible] Sivas [illegible]

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by.....

Varagunaswami at Melkote, be set aside & the subsequent petn of 19.12.35 on the same subject furnishing additional information,

I am directed to inform you that Govt see no reason to modify the orders passed in the matter. The enclosures received with on 19.12.35 are hereby returned, for reference & may be acknowledged.

Yours faithfully.

24/4/36
For Gen Secy

(2) Memo No 1507/Prog
Copy to the Hon'ble Sri Pasala Kala Mute Mysore for information.

Memo No 1508 27-4-36
(3) Copy to Sripadakanchana of Melkote

A-O

24/4/36
For Gen Secy

Memo No 1509 27-4-36
(4) Copy to Mr Dewanpur Shimoga.

Memo No 1510 27-4-36
(5) Copy to Mr Thiruvengadachar Ramanujachar Melkote

B-O
25/4/36
For Gen Secy

Memo No 1511/Prog
Encl see Sd
(6) Copy to the H.C. returning correspondence ending with records received with his letter No 427/S2-35 of 28/5/1935 on the subject

B-O
24/4/36
For Gen Sec.

B-O
25/4/36
For Gen Secy

20.4.36

pop 1-71